


REMARKS

The courtesy of the Examiner in granting the undersigned attorney and Richard S. MacMillan a personal interview on June 20, 2007 is gratefully acknowledged. During that interview, the language of Claim 1 was discussed in light of the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection. It was agreed that the language of Claim 1 as currently written sufficiently defines a tangible result, namely, the association of a particular path defined in a page description language specification with a plurality of special attributes. Thus, the Examiner agreed to withdraw this rejection upon filing of this response. It was also agreed that Claim 1 would be amended to correct a minor typographical error.

Claim 1 has been amended as agreed during the interview and, therefore, is believed to be in condition for allowance, along with dependent Claims 2, 3, and 4. New Claim 31 also depends from Claim 1 and recites the further step of using the particular path and the plurality of special attributes in a rendering command. Such further step defines another tangible result of the claimed method. Thus, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Staci E. Schweikert
Reg. No. 52,200

MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fifth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(419) 255-5900